

**FINAL REPORT
OF THE
COMMISSION ON COURTS**



**Indiana Legislative Services Agency
200 W. Washington St., Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789**

October, 1998

COMMISSION ON COURTS

Membership Roster

Senators

Richard Bray, Chair
Martinsville

David Ford
Hartford City

William Alexa
Valparaiso

Tim Lanane
Anderson

Representatives

Jesse Villalpando
East Chicago

Ralph Ayres
Chesterton

Kathy Richardson
Noblesville

Dale Sturtz
LaGrange

Lay Members

Hon. Ernest Yelton
Brazil

Mary Lou Schnell
Birdseye

Hon. Randall Shepard
Indianapolis

Sarah M. Taylor
Indianapolis

William Overdeer
Columbia City

LSA Staff

Susan Preble
Fiscal Analyst for the Committee

George Angelone
Attorney for the Committee

A copy of this report is available on the Internet. Reports, minutes and notices are organized by committee. This report and other documents for this Committee can be accessed from the General Assembly Homepage at <http://www.state.in.us/legislative/>.

I. STATUTORY AND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL DIRECTIVES

Indiana Code IC 33-1-15-7 directs the Commission on Courts to do the following:

- (1) Review and report on all requests for new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts. A request for review under this subdivision must be received by the Commission not later than July 1 of each year. A request received after July 1 may not be considered unless a majority of the Commission members agree to consider the request.
- (2) Conduct research concerning requests for new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts. This research may include the conduct of surveys sampling members of the bar, members of the judiciary, and local officials to determine needs and problems.
- (3) Conduct public hearings throughout Indiana concerning requests for new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts. The Commission shall hold at least one (1) public hearing on each request presented to the Commission.
- (4) Review and report on any other matters relating to court administration that the Commission determines appropriate, including the following:
 - (A) Court fees.
 - (B) Court personnel, except constables that have jurisdiction in a county that contains a consolidated city.
 - (C) Salaries of court officers and personnel, except constables that have jurisdiction in a county that contains a consolidated city.
 - (D) Jury selection.
 - (E) Any other issues relating to the operation of the courts.
- (5) Submit a report before November 1 of each year to the General Assembly that includes the following:
 - (A) A recommendation on all requests considered by the Commission during the preceding year for the creation of new courts or changes in the jurisdiction of existing courts.
 - (B) If the Commission recommends the creation of new courts or changes in jurisdiction of existing courts, the following:
 - (i) A draft of legislation implementing the changes.
 - (ii) A fiscal analysis of the cost to the state and local governments of implementing recommended changes.
 - (iii) Summaries of any research supporting the recommended changes.
 - (iv) Summaries of public hearings held concerning the recommended changes.
 - (C) A recommendation on any issues considered by the Commission under subdivision (4).

The Legislative Council assigned the following additional responsibilities to the Commission:

(1) Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 (SCR 42 - Sen. Bray; Sen. Worman) - : Study the bail bond system.

(2) Senate Bill 15 (SB 15 - Sen. Riegsecker) : Examine the concept of restorative justice.

(3) House Bill 1303 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 55 (HB 1303 - Rep. Kuzman; SCR 55 - Sen. Dempsey): Study mechanic's liens.

II. INTRODUCTION AND REASONS FOR STUDY

The Commission on Courts was established by the 1991 General Assembly to review the need for additional courts and for changes in the jurisdiction of existing courts. The Commission's creation was a result of the findings of the 1990 Interim Study Committee on Courts and Criminal Law Issues. That Committee found that current statutes contain neither procedures for creating courts nor specific criteria for the General Assembly to use in evaluating the need for new courts. The Committee concluded that this situation had allowed the creation of new courts that could not be justified on the basis of judicial workload.

The General Assembly provided for the expiration of the Commission after four years, on June 30, 1995, thus permitting an evaluation of the work and effectiveness of the Commission at that time. The 1995 General Assembly passed legislation extending the existence of the Commission on Courts until June 30, 1999, and making adjustments in the duties and operation of the Commission.

III. SUMMARY OF WORK PROGRAM

The Commission held six meetings during the interim following the conclusion of the 1998 Session as follows:

- The first meeting, held on July 2, 1998, was devoted to the study topics assigned by the Legislative Council and an update on the Weighted Caseload Study.
- At its second and third meetings, held on August 6, 1998 and August 20, 1998, the Commission focused on its statutory duty of reviewing requests for new courts and other judicial officers, and discussed extending the Commission's expiration date.
- At the fourth meeting, held on September 10, 1998, the Commission considered additional requests for new courts and judicial officers, discussed the concept of unified family courts, and heard testimony regarding judges' statements of economic interest and then returned to the issues assigned by the Legislative Council.
- At its fifth meeting, held on September 24, 1998, the Commission considered a salary increase for court officers, voted on preliminary drafts and discussed the bail bond system.

- At its sixth and final meeting, held on October 15, 1998, the Commission voted on its Findings and Recommendations to be presented to the 1999 General Assembly.

IV. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

A. FIRST MEETING (July 2, 1998):

The Commission reviewed the Resolutions containing the additional study topics assigned to it by the Legislative Council and made plans to begin hearing testimony on these issues. The Commission members agreed that the need for new judicial officers is the Commission's first priority, the bail bond system its second, and the mechanics lien issue its last priority.

Testimony was presented by former Senator and Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. Leslie Duvall, who now represents the Justice Fellowship. Mr. Duvall explained the Justice Fellowship is a faith-based organization whose mission is to promote biblical standards of justice and its interpretation of restorative justice. Mr. Al Wengerd, Executive Director of the Center for Community Justice in Elkhart, Indiana, testified as a practitioner of restorative justice for 20 years in Elkhart.

Ron Miller, Statistical Analyst, Division of State Court Administration, distributed copies of the 1997 Weighted Caseload Statistics and discussed 1997 case filings, individual court statistics for counties with unified court systems and a measure called the "relative severity" factor which spreads out a shortage or an excess of judicial officers among the current number of judicial officers in a county.

B. SECOND MEETING (August 6, 1998):

The Commission discussed when to recommend additional judges and magistrates. Judge Paul Mathias, President of the Indiana Judges' Association, and Judge Barbara Harcourt, Magistrate Committee Chairperson for the Indiana Judicial Conference testified to the important differences between judges and magistrates and reiterated the fact that while the state bears a higher cost for new judges than new magistrates, there is no right answer when determining whether to add a judge or a magistrate.

The Commission then heard testimony on requests for additional judicial officers in Allen, Marion, and Vanderburgh. Action on these requests was deferred until a subsequent meeting.

The final issue considered at this meeting concerned the extension of the Commission's expiration date from June 30, 1999 to June 30, 2003. The Commission reviewed a preliminary bill draft prepared by the Commission's attorney, George Angelone. The Commission approved it for recommendation to the 1999 General Assembly.

C. THIRD MEETING (August 20, 1998):

The Commission continued to hear testimony on requests for additional judicial officers in Clark, Dearborn, DeKalb, Elkhart, Floyd, Lake, LaPorte, Lawrence, Madison, Owen, and St. Joseph counties. Action on these requests was deferred until a subsequent meeting.

The Commission then considered a request from Rep. Ayres to convert the salaries of juvenile magistrates' salaries from 43% to 100% paid by the state. Discussion on the issue was scheduled for the fourth meeting. The final Commission meeting was scheduled for mid-October in order to confirm recommendations and vote on the final report due to the Legislative Council by November 1, 1998.

D. FOURTH MEETING (September 10, 1998):

At its fourth meeting, the Commission heard testimony from Indiana Supreme Court Justice Frank Sullivan, Jr., regarding the ABA Summit on Unified Family Courts and the applicability of the unified family courts concept in Indiana. Justice Sullivan stated that because different courts have jurisdiction over different matters, one family can have several cases before several judges, who may enter conflicting orders regarding custody, visitation, and other important family matters. He testified that unified family courts are better for families and taxpayers, because unified family courts are more cost effective and can better serve the needs of families than multiple courts. Justice Sullivan recommended that the General Assembly authorize and fund a unified family court project in large and small counties, and establish a task force to explore subsidiary issues and to analyze the outcome of such a project.

The Commission continued taking testimony on requests for additional judicial officers at its fourth meeting. Testimony was presented by representatives of Noble and St. Joseph counties. Commission action on these requests was deferred until the Commission's final meeting.

The Commission returned to the issue of the bail bond system. Judge Mathias then introduced Judge John Surbeck, Jr., of the Allen Superior Court. Judge Surbeck testified regarding the benefits of the public Pre-Trial Services agency (PTS) used in Allen County, which administers the 10% cash bond option and monitors defendants released on their own recognizance. Judge Surbeck stressed that bonds are set to guarantee the defendant's appearance in court and to assure the safety of the community and individuals. He reminded the Commission that until a defendant is tried and convicted, there is a presumption of innocence which should not be forgotten when setting a bond, and that the goal is to set the lowest possible bond with the fewest conditions that will guarantee the defendant's appearance and the safety of others. Judge Surbeck testified that the public bond system is efficient and saves taxpayers money.

The Commission also heard testimony from Les Sebring, President of United Surety Agents, Inc., who stated that for 10% of the bail amount, surety agents assume the full responsibility of bringing the defendant to court, and apprehending them if they flee. Mr. Sebring explained that profit is related to risk, and that he believes that a first time misdemeanant or minor felon who is a permanent resident should be released and all

others should be required to use a surety agent. He recommended the reintroduction of SB 264-1998 which proposes to make cash deposits cost effective by restricting their use.

Magistrate T. Edward Page, representing the Lake Superior Court and the Lake County Bar Association, told the Commission that the cash bail system has unanimous support in Lake County. He testified that the long-term failure to appear rate in Lake County is 7%. He stated that cash bail is often the only source from which to pay court costs, restitution to the victim, and attorney's fees. Magistrate Page testified that the cash bail system increases a defendant's chances for private representation and reduces reliance on public defenders. He explained to the Commission that most surety bonds do not get forfeited and that the statute allows courts to forgive payment if a bondsman shows due diligence.

The Commission also took testimony regarding the requirement that judges report gifts from families on their statements of economic interest. Meg Babcock of the Commission on Judicial Qualifications proposed legislation identical to that which the Commission recommended last year. The legislation provides an exemption for close family members and defines "close family member".

Next, the Commission took up the issue of converting the salaries of juvenile magistrates from 43% to 100% paid by the state. Magistrate Thomas Felts, Allen Circuit Court, testified in favor of the proposed conversion and reminded the Commission that it gave its approval to the conversion last year and recommended it to the General Assembly last session.

Finally, Robert Palmer of the Associated General Contractors of Indiana, Inc., testified regarding the mechanic's lien law. He told the Commission that the goal is to reach consensus among the construction and banking industries and propose a compromise bill, but recognized that a compromise might be difficult to reach before the Commission's final meeting.

E. FIFTH MEETING (September 24, 1998):

Judge Paul Mathias, President of the Indiana Judges' Association, asked the Commission to consider a salary increase for court officers. Judge Mathias pointed out that though Indiana has the fourteenth largest population in the country, the salary for judges is ranked thirty-second.

Judge Mathias argued that judges should be treated as state employees and receive the same increases that state employees receive. He reported that by calculating the impact that yearly state increases would have had on judges' salaries, he determined that they have lost \$383,000 in purchasing power over the last twenty-five years. He told the Commission that the cost to raise judges' salaries from \$90,000 to \$104,000 would cost \$9.2 million. Although Judge Mathias advocated that the increase should be a budget item, he also suggested that it could be funded by increasing civil court costs or by changing the state/county/local distribution of court cost revenue in the alternative.

The Commission then turned its attention to evaluating the county requests for additional officers made during the interim session. Senator Bray stated that the Commission's recommendations would all be included in one bill for the 1999 session. The Commission also voted on preliminary drafts, and discussed the bail bond system.

Representative Ayres made a request that the Commission discuss if and when jury lists should be open to the public.

F. SIXTH MEETING (October 15, 1998):

Judge Mathias again asked the Commission to consider raising the salaries for court officers.

Stephen Johnson, Director of the Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council, testified in support of the proposal requiring judges to reside in the district they serve. He also expressed the Council's support of the amendment that would require candidates for prosecuting attorney to reside in the district they would serve.

Representative Villalpando asked that the preliminary draft adding new magistrates and courts be amended to reflect an additional court instead of a magistrate for the Lake County Superior Court, County Division. The Commission then voted on the Commission's recommendations to be made to the 1999 General Assembly and approved the draft of the Commission's Final Report.

V. COMMISSION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. ACTION RELATED TO 1997 COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (1) Judges' statement of economic interest: See PD 3133 (1999)
- (2) Establishment of the Commission on Restorative Justice: See PD 3019 (1999)
- (3)* Family court project: See Commission on Courts Resolution 98-1 (1999)
- (4)**Payment of juvenile magistrates: See PD 3346 (1999)

FINDINGS: Several of these bills were complicated by the addition throughout the 1998 legislative session of other subjects that were not recommendations of the Commission. For this reason, as well as the expiration of time within which to pass all of the measures, the bills were not passed. The Commission finds that the need for each of these proposals is still present, and that the passage of these proposals is important.

* The family court project is a worthy endeavor which the Commission supports. The Commission recognizes that the funding for the project has been included in the Supreme Court's budget and therefore finds a resolution in support of the project is more appropriate than a bill proposal. The Commission adopted Resolution 98-1 for that purpose.

** The Commission finds that the juvenile magistrates' were not included in the legislation which converted judges' salaries to fully state paid due to an

oversight. Consequently, the Commission finds that the payment of juvenile magistrates' salaries should be paid entirely by the state, rather than sharing the cost with counties.

RECOMMENDATION:

Each of the measures should be re-introduced during the 1999 Session of the General Assembly.

The Commission on Courts recommends that the General Assembly approve the Supreme Court's request for funding of a family court project in the amount of \$200,000 per state fiscal year during the Biennium beginning July 1, 1999, and ending June 30, 2001.

The Commission recommends that PD 3346 be introduced in the 1999 session of the General Assembly. The PD is similar to SB 354 (1998), which was approved by the Commission in 1997, with the exception that the St. Joseph County magistrate is no longer included because the position is currently fully paid by the state.

B. EXTENSION OF THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE COMMISSION ON COURTS

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that the need for its existence continues

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission recommends that its expiration date be extended from June 30, 1999 to June 30, 2003. Preliminary Draft 3018 satisfactorily meets this recommendation and should be introduced during the 1999 Session of the General Assembly.

C. ISSUES REFERRED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL:

(1) SCR 42: Study the bail bond system:

FINDINGS:

The Commission on Courts finds that sufficient time was not available to thoroughly examine issues regarding the bail bond system.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission makes no recommendation at this time.

(2) SB 15: Examine the concept of restorative justice:

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that the concept of restorative justice and its applicability in Indiana is worthy of additional consideration. The Commission finds that the concept requires significant examination of the current criminal justice system and that a separate commission dedicated solely to studying restorative justice and its appropriate use in Indiana is needed.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission recommends the establishment of a Commission on Restorative Justice, similar to the framework proposed in SB 15 (1998). The Commission also recommends that two additional members be added to the membership of the proposed commission: one county commissioner and one county council member. Preliminary Draft 3019 satisfactorily meets these needs and was recommended by the Commission for introduction during the 1999 Session of the General Assembly.

(3) HB 1303 and HCR 53: Study mechanic's liens:

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that any revision of the mechanic's lien law requires compromise and consensus among the parties most affected by mechanic's liens. Such compromise and consensus has not been achieved by the parties involved. Resolution of the issues involved requires more time than the Commission was able to dedicate during the interim session.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission makes no recommendation at this time.

D. REQUESTS FROM THE INDIANA JUDGES ASSOCIATION AND THE DIVISION OF STATE COURT ADMINISTRATION:

(1) Information required to be reported on economic impact statements of judges:

FINDINGS:

There is a disparity between the financial disclosure requirements imposed on judges and those imposed on other elected officials. While other elected officials are exempted from reporting most gifts from spouses and other close relatives, judges are required to report these gifts. The Commission finds that judges and other elected public officials should be treated uniformly on this issue.

RECOMMENDATION:

Legislation, as set out in Preliminary Draft 3133, should be introduced in the 1999 Session of the General Assembly to eliminate the requirement that judges report most gifts from spouses and close relatives.

(2) Salary Increase for Court Officials

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Commission on Courts finds that a salary increase for court officers is needed. The Commission on Courts finds that the discretionary maximum \$5,000 county supplement should be eliminated.

E. REQUESTS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

(1) Rep. Ayres: Jury selection system and public access to jury lists

Rep. Ayres' proposal provides that jury lists drawn in Lake County or in another county that adopts the alternative jury selection procedures added by P.L.4-1998 may be kept confidential if the judge believes that public disclosure would endanger the safety of potential or selected jurors, or lead to jury tampering.

(2) Rep. Sturtz: Conversion of Noble County Court to a Superior Court.

Rep. Sturtz' proposal converts the Noble County Court to a superior court.

(3) Rep. Avery: Residency requirements for superior court judges while in office

Rep. Avery's proposal establishes a uniform requirement that a judge be a resident of the judicial district that the judge serves. The proposal affects all county court judges,

the probate court judge in St. Joseph County, and superior court judges in the following districts: Allen, Cass, Clay, Grant, Floyd, Howard, Hancock, Jasper, Kosciusko, Lake, Lawrence, Madison, Morgan, Ohio and Switzerland, Porter, St. Joseph, Tippecanoe, Vanderburgh, Vigo, and Wayne counties. It requires a nominee for a vacancy on the Lake superior court or St. Joseph superior court to be a resident of the county. It requires a judicial candidate for the Vanderburgh superior court to be a resident of the county. The proposal exempts a current judge from the application of the residency requirement until the end of the judge's current term.

(4) Rep. Scholer: Levy controls on court funding

Rep. Scholer's proposal revives the concepts outlined in HB 1761-1997, which requires that a county deposit court fees in a court fund established by the county instead of depositing them in the county's general fund. HB 1761-1997 also provides that court-related expenditures (including judges' salaries, probation services, etc.) be paid from the fund if they are not paid from the family and children's fund.

(5) Sen. Lawson: Assessment of Jury Costs in Criminal Trials

Sen. Lawson's request asked the Commission to consider the issue of whether legislation should be proposed to give authority to trial courts to assess jury costs in criminal trials. In Gooch v. State, a case decided in 1997, the Indiana Court of Appeals held that a trial court does not have the authority to assess jury costs against a defendant.

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that a need exists to keep jury lists confidential in certain circumstances.

The Commission finds that converting the Noble County Court to a superior court would enable the court system in Noble County to better serve its citizens. It finds that such a conversion would result in the expansion of the existing county court judge's jurisdiction, which would result in more effective caseload management.

The Commission finds that judges should be residents in the district they serve. The Commission also finds that prosecuting attorneys should also be required to be residents in the districts they serve.

The Commission was not able to consider the issue of levy controls on court funding due to time constraints.

The Commission was also not able to consider the issue of the assessment of jury costs in criminal trials due to time constraints.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission voted to recommend 1999 PD 3432 which provides that jury lists drawn in certain counties may be kept confidential if the judge determines that public disclosure would endanger jurors or encourage jury tampering.

The Commission voted to recommend that the Noble County Court be converted to a Superior Court with small claims and misdemeanor jurisdiction. The recommendation is included 1999 PD 3443 with all other judicial officer requests recommended by the Commission.

The Commission voted to recommend 1999 PD 3456, which requires judges and prosecuting attorneys reside in the districts they serve, to the General Assembly.

F. DETERMINING THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL OFFICERS:

FINDINGS:

The need for a uniform and objective system of determining the level of need for additional judicial officers in counties submitting requests is paramount. The Weighted Caseload Study released by the Indiana Judicial Center in January, 1997 is a useful tool, providing baseline information comparing caseloads by attributing weights to various types of cases and average judicial time devoted to each activity. The Study was updated in 1998 with judicial officer need information for each court, rather than just applied to the county as a whole. In addition, the updated Study includes a “relative severity factor” measure which spreads the shortage/excess among all judicial officers in courts of record in that county. However, the Commission recognizes that the Study alone does not provide a complete view of each and every court in the state.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Commission determined that counties with a need for less than one officer according to the Weighted Caseload Study should not be included in the Commission’s recommendations for additional officers to the General Assembly.

Rep. Villalpando recommended that the Commission create two new superior courts for the civil division in Lake County in addition to that court’s request for two magistrates, and eliminate the superior court- juvenile division’s request for two magistrates.

Sen. Ford’s motion to decrease the St. Joseph County probate court’s request from two magistrates to one was adopted by consent.

G. REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL OFFICERS:

The following requests were made before the Commission on Courts during the 1998 interim session:

- (1) Allen County: Request for additional magistrates.
Allen Superior Court-Civil: 2 magistrates
Allen Superior Court-Criminal: 1 magistrate
- (2) Clark County: Request for 1 magistrate.
- (3) Dearborn County: Request for either a new court or one magistrate.
Dearborn Circuit Court: 1 magistrate
Dearborn County Court: convert county to superior court and add 1 additional superior court
- (4) DeKalb County: Request for 1 new court
- (5) Elkhart County: Request for either 1 new court or 1 magistrate.
- (6) Floyd County: Request for 1 magistrate.
- (7) Lake County: Request for additional magistrates.
Lake Circuit Court: 2 magistrates
Lake Superior Court-Civil Division: 2 magistrates
Lake Superior Court-Juvenile Division: 2 magistrates
Lake Superior Court-County Division: 3 magistrates
- (8) LaPorte County: Request for 1 magistrate.
- (9) Lawrence County: Request for 1 magistrate.
- (10) Madison County: Request for 1 magistrate
- (11) Marion County: Request for 10 magistrates and 4 new courts.
- (12) Noble County: Convert county court to a superior court
- (13) Owen County: Request for 1 magistrate.
- (14) St. Joseph County: Request for additional magistrates
St. Joseph Circuit Court: 1 magistrate
St. Joseph Probate Court: 2 magistrates
St. Joseph Superior Court: 2 magistrates
- (15) Vanderburgh County: Request for additional magistrates.
Vanderburgh Superior Court: 3 magistrates
Vanderburgh Circuit Court: 1 magistrate

FINDINGS:

The Commission finds that it is of the utmost importance for the legislature to pass legislation for additional judicial officers for the counties with the most documented need during the 1999 Session of the General Assembly.

RECOMMENDATION:

Legislation should be introduced in the 1999 Session of the General Assembly to create additional judicial officers as follows:

<u>County</u>	<u>Additional Officers Recommended</u>
Allen	Superior court-civil division: 2 magistrates Superior court-criminal division: 1 magistrate
Clark	1 magistrate
Dearborn	Convert county court to a superior court
Elkhart	1 superior court
Floyd	1 magistrate
Lake	Circuit court: 1 magistrate Superior court civil division: 2 magistrates and 2 courts Superior court county division: 1 court
LaPorte	1 magistrate
Marion	10 magistrates & 4 courts
Noble	Convert county court to a superior court
St. Joseph	Circuit court: 1 magistrate Probate court: 1 magistrate Superior court: 2 magistrates
Vanderburgh	Superior court: 3 magistrates

WITNESS LIST:

July 2, 1998:

Leslie Duvall, Justice Fellowship
Ron Miller, Division of State Court Administration
Al Wengerd, Center for Community Justice

August 6, 1998:

Representative Dennis Avery
Judge Patricia Gifford, Marion Superior Court
Judge Barbara Harcourt, Indiana Judicial Conference
Judge Carl Heldt, Vanderburgh Circuit Court
Judge Paul Mathias, Allen County Superior Court, Civil Division & Indiana Judges' Association
Judge Maurice O'Connor, Vanderburgh Superior Court
Magistrate Tracy Edward Page, Lake Superior Court, Criminal Division
Judge Thomas Ryan, Allen County Circuit Court

August 20, 1998:

Judge George Beamer, Jr., St. Joseph Superior Court
Judge Julie Cantrell, Lake Superior Court, County Division
Pat Coughill, Dearborn/Ohio County Bar Association
Judge James Danikolas, Lake Superior Court, Civil Division
Judge Steven Fleece, Clark County Superior Court
Judge Robert Gilmore, LaPorte County Circuit Court
Judge David Hopper, Madison County Court
Jim Humphrey, incoming Dearborn/Ohio Circuit Court
Richard Lorenz, Attorney, Owen County
Judge Richard McIntyre, Lawrence Circuit Court
Judge Anthony Meyer, Dearborn/Ohio Circuit Court
Magistrate Christina Miller, Lake County Circuit Court
Judge Frank Nardi, Owen Circuit Court
Judge Thomas Newman, Jr., Madison Superior Court 3
Magistrate Charlotte Peller, Lake County Superior Court, Juvenile Division
Judge Stephen Platt, Elkhart County Superior Court
Judge Richard Striegel, Floyd County Superior Court
Judge Kevin Wallace, DeKalb Superior Court
Judge Michael Witte, Dearborn County Court

September 10, 1998

Meg Babcock, Commission on Judicial Qualifications
Judge Mary Lee Comer, Indiana Judges' Association
Judge Terry Crone, St. Joseph Circuit Court
Magistrate Tom Felts, Allen Circuit Court
Judge Michael Kramer, Noble County Court

Judge Paul Mathias, Allen County Superior Court, Civil Division & Indiana Judges' Association
Judge Peter Nemeth, St. Joseph Probate Court
Magistrate Tracy Edward Page, Lake Superior Court, Criminal Division
Robert Palmer, Associated General Contractors of Indiana, Inc.
Les Sebring, United Surety Agents, Inc.
Lee Sexton, Midwest Bonding
Representative Dale Sturtz
Justice Frank Sullivan, Jr., Indiana Supreme Court
Judge John Surbeck, Jr., Allen Superior Court

September 24, 1998

Judge Paul Mathias, Indiana Judges' Association

October 15, 1998

Stephen Johnson, Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys Council
Judge Paul Mathias, Indiana Judges' Association